



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,100	11/17/2003	Dick C. Hardt	SXIP-01SPUS	9784
26744 7590 10/28/2008 PERLEY-ROBERTSON, HILL & MCDUGALL LLP 1400-340 Albert Street OTTAWA, ON K1R 0A5 CANADA				
EXAMINER				
OSMAN, RAMY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2457				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,100

Applicant(s)

HARDT, DICK C.

Examiner

RAMY M. OSMAN

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on July 28, 2008, where applicant amended claim 1. Claims 1-8 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. The previous 101 rejections are withdrawn in light of the amendments.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. On bottom of page 7 and top of page 8 of Applicant refers to portions of the instant specification in an attempt to explain a situation that Levosky might not anticipate.

In reply, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., paragraphs 14,45-48 of instant specification) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5. On page 8, Applicant argues that Levosky does not teach collecting website identification information for each request, and does not centrally store the information for centralized analysis.

In reply, In the middle of page 7 of Applicants arguments, Applicant has admitted and acknowledges that Levosky in column 5 line 55 teaches “*that the user can submit information in a “note” field that can later be used to remind the user about where the alias was generated*”. Applicant is further directed to column 4 lines 49-57 where Levosky mentions that when filling

out a form, in order to request generation of an alias address, the user includes a note/message in the form that will be associated with the created alias address. This note/message will then be included in any email that is sent from a sender and the note/message will be used for reminding the user what this alias address is being used for (column 5 line 55). Levosky shows Figure 4 which includes an example message that a user has input: "For computer components only" (column 4 lines 51-52). This satisfies the claim limitation "identification information" since the note/message is used to identify what and where the alias address is for.

The note/message is then sent to the alias email server along with the other information entered by the user so that all the information can be centrally stored into "alias user records" (Levosky, column 4 line 67) in a server database. This allows centralized analysis of all the created alias addresses and their corresponding user entered information.

However, Levosky fails to explicitly teach that the note/message is a "website identification information". This is just a slight difference from "identification information" (which is already taught by Levosky) and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. If a user desired to create an alias address to be submitted to a particular website, for shopping or subscription purposes etc., then it would be obvious to identify the particular website in the note/message so that the user can later be reminded what that alias address is associated with.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1,2,4-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levosky (US Patent No 7,054,906.

8. In reference to claim 1, Levosky teaches a pseudonymous email address generator for generating a pseudonymous email address associated with an email address, the generator comprising:

a request interface, for receiving a pseudonymous email address generation request from an identity management system(column 4 lines 20-25 and column 4 line 63 – column 5 line 20), the request containing website identification information (column 4 lines 49-57); and

a processor for executing stored instructions to provide a pseudonymous email address creator for creating a pseudonymous email address associated with a mail server in response to the received pseudonymous email address generation request (column 4 line 63 – column 5 line 5), for associating the pseudonymous email address with an email address (column 4 lines 27-32 and column 5 lines 4-20), for providing the created pseudonymous email address and its associated email address to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address (column 3 line 65 – column 4 line 3) for providing the created pseudonymous email address to the identity management system (column 5 lines 19-25) and for storing the website identification information with the associated pseudonymous email address to allow centralized analysis (column 4 lines 63-67). (see also Levosky, claim 1 steps a-c)

However, Levosky fails to explicitly teach that the note/message is a “website identification information”. This is just a slight difference from “identification information” (which is already taught by Levosky) and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. If

a user desired to create an alias address to be submitted to a particular website, for shopping or subscription purposes etc., then it would be obvious to identify the particular website in the note/message so that the user can later be reminded what that alias address is associated with.

9. In reference to claim 2, Levosky teaches the generator of claim 1 including a mail server interface for receiving from the pseudonymous email address creator both the pseudonymous email address and the email address associated with the pseudonymous email address, and for providing them to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address in a predetermined format (column 5 lines 27-48).

10. In reference to claim 4, Levosky teaches the generator of claim 1 wherein the pseudonymous email address creator includes means for defining properties of the pseudonymous email address, the properties selected from a list including a friendly name associated with the pseudonymous email address, a management link and corresponding attachment method and the email address the pseudonymous email address is associated with, and for providing the defined properties to the associated mail server (column 4 lines 25-40 and column 8 lines 35-50).

11. In reference to claim 5, Levosky teaches the generator of claim 1 further including a rules engine for defining a set of routing rules in accordance with requests received by the request interface, for associating the defined set of rules with pseudonymous email addresses generated by the pseudonymous email address creator, and for providing the created set of rules to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address (column 7 lines 1-8 and column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

12. In reference to claim 6, Levosky teaches the generator of claim 5 wherein the rules engine further includes means for defining the routing rules in accordance with a set of parameters defined in the pseudonymous email address generation request (column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

13. In reference to claim 7, Levosky teaches the generator of claim 5 wherein the rules engine further includes means for defining the routing rules in accordance with a set of default parameters (column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

14. In reference to claim 8, Levosky teaches the generator of claim 7 wherein the default parameters are dependent upon a requester identifier associated with the pseudonymous email address generation request (column 8 line 62 – column 9 line 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levosky (US Patent No 7,054,906) in view of Rounthwaite et al (US Patent Publication No 2004/0177110).

Levosky teaches the generator of claim 1 further including a request analysis engine for receiving from the request interface an indication of the destination of the requested alias (column 8 lines 30-60). Levosky fails to explicitly teach for determining in accordance with the

indication that the email address associated with the pseudonymous email address is a honeypot address. However, Rounthwaite discloses honeypot addresses for the purpose of trapping and detecting spam (§ 72-74). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Levosky by determining in accordance with the indication that the email address associated with the pseudonymous email address is a honeypot address as per the teachings of Rounthwaite for the purpose of trapping and detecting spam.

Conclusion

17. The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy M Osman/
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

October 22, 2008